

(54)

College

820.6
C 68

Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

APR 19 1951

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

EDITOR

CHAS. W. ROBERTS, *University of Illinois*

EDITORIAL BOARD

FREDERICK BRACHER, *Pomona College*; CATHERINE FOSTER, *Bennington College*; WRIGHT THOMAS, *State U. of New York, State Teachers College at Cortland*; CARLTON WELLS, *University of Michigan*; RICHARD WELLS, *Carnegie Tech*; J. HOOPER WISE, *University of Florida*

Vol. II

February, 1951

No. 1

THE PROBLEM OF FRESHMAN ENGLISH IN THE PROFESSIONAL

SCHOOL—*C. Harold Gray* 3

THE FRESHMAN AT COMPOSITION—*Josephine Miles* 7

DARKNESS IS KING: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR KNICKERBOCKER—

Donald J. Lloyd 10

SECRETARY'S REPORT—*George S. Wykoff* 13

College Composition and Communication is published quarterly in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter June 28, 1950, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to W. Wilbur Hatfield, 211 West 68th Street, Chicago 21, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to Charles W. Roberts, 204a Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

National Council of Teachers of English

Conference on College Composition and Communication

1951 OFFICERS

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, <i>Chairman</i> Purdue University	GLENN J. CHRISTENSEN, <i>Secretary</i> Lehigh University
HAROLD B. ALLEN, <i>Associate Chairman</i> University of Minnesota	CHARLES W. ROBERTS, <i>Editor</i> University of Illinois
W. WILBUR HATFIELD, <i>Treasurer</i> 211 West 68th St., Chicago	

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITIES

HAROLD E. BRIGGS, Southern California
C. REXFORD DAVIS, Rutgers
CLYDE W. DOW, Michigan State
JOHN C. GERBER, Iowa
KENNETH L. KNICKERBOCKER, Tennessee
GLENN H. LEGGETT, Ohio State
HENRY W. SAMS, Chicago

LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

NEWMAN B. BIRK, Tufts
WAYNE L. BRITTON, San Francisco State
KARL W. DYKEMA, Youngstown
MAX FULLER, Grinnell
SR. MIRIAM JOSEPH, C.S.C., Saint Mary's
JAMES MASON, Arkansas State
WATERS TURPIN, Morgan State

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

PAUL W. BARRUS, East Texas State
H. R. BARTLETT, Mass. Inst. Tech.
HARVEY EAGLESON, Calif. Inst. Tech.
MENTOR WILLIAMS, Illinois Tech.

TEACHERS COLLEGES

T. A. BARNHART, St. Cloud
WILLIAM T. BEAUCHAMP, Geneseo
JANE DALE, Oregon College of Ed.
FREIDA JOHNSON, Peabody

JUNIOR COLLEGES

BEVERLY FISHER, Santa Monica
JOSIAH L. GEIST, Wright
RALPH LEYDEN, Stephens
SHANNON MORTON, Wilmington

Per. P.R.
Jeff
W. E. Rice
4-14-51

The Problem of Freshman English In the Professional School¹

C. HAROLD GRAY ²

The major problems before English departments in professional schools have seemed to some of my colleagues to be the students' woeful lack of preparation and the small fragments of time given to English in the professional curriculum. The first of these will not differentiate our situation from anybody else's. I doubt also whether there is very much difference between the amount of English required to majors in many fields of the liberal arts and that required in professional curricula. Even if it were the major problem, we should not need to talk to each other about it, but go to the curriculum makers. Certainly the engineering schools, since the last war, have gone a long way toward correcting some of their narrowness by requiring a rather generously increased amount of humanistic and social studies. As legatees of that generosity we English teachers have our work cut out for us to justify what we do with the time given us.

If then we do not simply ask for more time to teach English, what improvements in the quality or what changes in the character of the courses should we aim at? I take as a fundamental tenet in the philosophy of education the necessity of understanding all we can about the students we teach. The ideal would be to teach individuals and to adapt the course to each one's abilities, interests, and desires. Since

we must work in the mass, however, we should do well to seize upon any group characteristics which may assist us in focussing our efforts more effectively.

The pre-professional groups are distinguished from most of their fellow-students by the very fact of having chosen a profession. In young people this choice gives a motivation to their work that ought not to be ignored. Even if they may seem to us thereby to have narrowed their educational objectives, that probability is a part of the situation we face. One reaction to it would be to attack them, explicitly or implicitly, for their narrowness, to talk to them about the danger of "closing their minds to life, etc.,," and to expect them to have as keen an interest in their "education for citizenship," or whatever we call it, as they have in their training for their vocations. That would seem to me to be psychologically doomed to failure. Furthermore, we should be widening the gap between us and the professional departments. They already feel us to be a standing rebuke to their "narrowness"—here the word is theirs. Scratch an engineering teacher and you'll find just below the surface a real sense of insecurity and humility before our brand of intellectual wares. I wish I could say we have the same humility before their knowledge. We need to get together with them as closely as we can on the job of educating the young pre-professionals. We should try to avoid any charge of driving a wedge between their concerns and ours. We should not emphasize the differences

¹ A paper read at the 1950 conference of the CCCC, meeting at the Hotel Stevens, Chicago, March 24-25.

² Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York.

between those concerns as though a man could choose in his life to attend to one or the other. We may split the bodies of knowledge and the techniques of thinking and communicating into sections for academic administration; but we cannot split human beings up this way.

We have live human beings to teach, and an ambition to become professionals is a part of their living natures. If, on the contrary, they have made only a half-hearted or unreasoned choice, it is still part of our duty to make them understand what they have done. For their own good, as well as for the good of the professional institutions of which we are a part, such half-hearted or unreasoned choice should be turned into genuine professional self-consciousness. This will not be done by ignoring the fact which is so important in the minds of most of them, nor by asking them to forget it while they learn, with us, how to be "men" or "good citizens." They have got to be made to see that in learning to be good professional men they must include some processes which they go through now, every day or hour, but which they have neglected to take seriously as part of their professional education. That is a tougher job for us than to tell them to leave all their scientific habits and technological preoccupations behind them as they enter our classrooms. Unless we adjust ourselves to these young animals' habits and preoccupations, we shall touch them nowhere.

The major problem peculiar to the teaching of English in technical institutions is therefore to get teachers and students to occupy certain ground together and to take up certain well-defined relations within its limits. As soon as the students find that we are talking to them as though they were professionals already, that we honor

them as such, and that our business touches their business, they will open their minds to us. In order to do this most satisfactorily, I would urge upon the heads of freshman English courses to demand segregated classes. Our teachers will find in the situation a challenge such as they have never had. In any mixed class it is possible to find a few literary lights who will carry a discussion for us. We have even reasoned from that comforting fact that it is good for the aggies and engineers to be exposed to the fertilization from their more literary fellow-students. I charge you honestly to scrutinize this rationalization. Doesn't the aggie or engineer take refuge in the reflection that such skill or such curiosity may be all right for a preacher or a lawyer or a house-wife, but not for him? He will perform enough of the tasks perfunctorily or with his tongue in his cheek to get a passing grade. We are all concerned with something more vital than that.

Now put a group of these people together and recognize certain important common interests and habits of thought, even common prejudices. To define them as "*just men*"—"even as other men are"—gives us too much room to rattle round in. To challenge them on their own ground will give them a self-respect they may not even have been aware of. If we do it honestly, we shall create an effect like that which a father creates in his son when he gives him his first cigar or first sincerely asks his advice. We may indeed have to tell him how as a member of his profession he *ought* to look at a question. While we may do it in order eventually to challenge that way of looking, we have given him his ground to stand on and we shall be taken as a friend beckoning him to venture towards new ground. We thus contribute to his professional maturation as well as to his awareness

of what relation our business has to his. Furthermore, in his attempts to grasp what "English" is about, he will be competing only with his fellows. Together they will form a solid bloc against the teacher from that so-called "other world." Provided the teacher knows his ground and is not either afraid of them or theirs, nor contemptuous of them, the experience of that classroom will be good for everybody.

It is therefore the character of the teaching of English which seems to me to be the major problem peculiar to freshman English in professional schools. We should cherish the group characteristics in our students, both to perpetuate them and to mature them, and to get them to spread their branches into wider heavens. The students will be different and will call for different strategy in teaching. How far that means a differentiation in the material taken up in the classes will depend a great deal upon the teacher. It does not seem necessary to have a separate set of readings for aggies, engineers, foresters, and others, though I should not rule out such a scheme in the hands of an imaginative teacher. I am not primarily seeking a set of co-ordinates like O'Neill's *Dynamo* for engineers, *The Growth of the Soil* for aggies, and *The Bent Twig* for foresters. Nor do I even think that we should necessarily try to lead from the *Scientific American* to Shakespeare by easy stages. I have tried to make clear my conviction that the character of a course properly changes with the intellectual grounds on which students and teachers consciously take their stand. The pre-professional groups have a homogeneity which we ought to recognize and make use of in our educational planning. Teachers of communication should certainly realize that any good piece of communication, like, for exam-

ple, an hour in a freshman English course, should first of all take account of the receivers of the communication. On this ground, I will set up my battle-cry for "Hamlet for engineers," "Hamlet for the farmers," and "Hamlet for the foresters."

It should not be necessary for me to say that I do not think that what Shakespeare meant in *Hamlet* is affected by putting the play before engineers. I do mean that the problem of teaching *Hamlet* is directly affected by the characteristics of the people to whom any one of us teaches it. If teaching means merely explaining with a show of objectivity what Shakespeare says, it may not matter to whom we explain it. If we intend, however, by some art of communication to assist in bringing the minds of students in more direct relation with Shakespeare or even with our own interpretation of the play, we shall need to know as much about those minds as possible. We cannot afford to neglect any such vivid characteristic as that of professional bent in our appraisal of the job of communication. In this sense we have to think of the concept of "engineer" as well as think of *Hamlet*. We are faced with the problem of "Hamlet for engineers": we didn't make the problem; but we can't duck it.

This thesis of mine is not unheard of in the history of education. Most of the problems in education in the United States have developed with the growth of mass education. A curriculum addressed to an intellectual aristocracy in the 18th and 19th centuries could be prepared with a knowledge of the backgrounds and professional ambitions of the students in mind, and it undoubtedly was so prepared. When we began to shape curricula for all kinds of students, we fell into the error of failing to take into account the backgrounds and professional interests on which had been

based a more effective curriculum in earlier days. We began to think that we were dealing with that abstraction, the "human being," or that other abstraction, the "citizen." The fact that we are facing here today this question of uniformity or diversity shows that something may have been left out of our recent practices. My own experience in teaching English to engineers and scientists as well as my own interpretation of educational psychology, has led me to believe that every ascertainable diversity in student groups can be utilized in planning and conducting courses in English or any other subject.

The practical steps such a conviction leads to immediately are two. In those institutions where it has been the prac-

tice to lump all kinds of students in sections for English composition or literature, the English department should take the lead in finding means for segregating the pre-professional students from others. In engineering schools like Rensselaer the segregation is of course already done for us. Secondly, the teachers of English in all such segregated classes should prepare themselves for their work by conscientious and sympathetic study, not solely of language and literature, but of the students they have before them. The more they study them the more they will discover of the importance of their vocational choices, aspirations, and characteristic ways of viewing the world.

Conference on College Composition and Communication

MEMBERSHIPS AVAILABLE

Individual membership: a year's subscription to *College Composition and Communication*; full voting and other privileges at the annual fall business meeting; participation privileges at the annual spring conference.....\$2.00

Institutional-sustaining membership: May be taken out by an institution in the name of one individual, who enjoys all the privileges of individual membership; provides also two extra copies of *College Composition and Communication* for deposit in the college library or for circulation among interested staff members.....\$10.00

NOTE: Since the Conference on College Composition and Communication is a subsidiary of the National Council of Teachers of English, an applicant for individual membership and the one person designated for the institutional-sustaining membership must be, or become, a member of the NCTE. The annual fee for membership in the college section of NCTE is \$4.00; members receive *College English* monthly during the school year.

Address orders to W. Wilbur Hatfield, Treasurer CCCC, 211 West 68th Street, Chicago 21, Illinois.

The Freshman at Composition

JOSEPHINE MILES¹

At the first meeting of an English 1A class, in February 1948, I asked the thirty students to write a half-hour essay on their home town. I did not discuss the problem except to say that by an essay I meant a brief and unified exposition which would make clear to the reader the student's town as he saw it.

The following paper on Pittsburgh represents the work of two-thirds of the class.

I

It has often been said that if Pittsburgh, New York, and perhaps two or three other cities were bombed until their industry was rendered useless that the United States would be powerless and at the supreme will of the enemy. Such a statement is possibly very true.

My home town is Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and I take great pride in the fact that Pittsburgh is my hometown. The great steel industry gave my family a very comfortable living. I was able to develop in the city in a way that I had pride in my town. Pittsburgh—a city of about 700,000—seemed to me a small town where I had interest in the surroundings and events in every part of the city.

Pittsburgh is not merely a memory of smoke and soot to me, but more as a place that recalls memories of gay and colorful times. Picnic grounds, city parks, zoos, and even the smoke stacks of other cities will never have the appeal to my eyes as those of Pittsburgh.

* * *

The reader will note that each separate paragraph makes a separate point, the first about the vulnerability and importance of large cities, the second about the familiar comfort of Pittsburgh as a town to grow up in, the third about the memory of good times despite smoke and soot. In no way do these three points make a whole. The student has taken no responsible point of view; he has not thought of the city as a whole;

he has not thought of his essay as a unit.

This lack of responsibility, characteristic of most of the members of the class, seems to me the central serious problem in the teaching of composition. Matters of sentence and paragraph structure, of agreement, reference, and transition, all seem to me subordinate to, and indeed dependent upon, the matter of the student's responsibility for his own guiding ideas. Sentence-making is predication, and to predicate is to assert an idea, selecting and treating facts from a point of view. Paragraph-making is the development of such ideas and the relationship between them. Composition involves an individual responsibility of thought. The student from Pittsburgh does not compose.

The best single summary one could make of this essay would say that though Pittsburgh is important as an industrial center it is also pleasant as a home; but this statement does not really reflect the student's intentions. When, at the next meeting, I asked each student to write one sentence summarizing his essay, this student wrote, "My home town is one of the greatest steel centers in the world situated around the point where the two rivers join to form the Ohio." Most other sentences were equally far from their essays and equally unuseful as even possible ideas for development. It seemed to me therefore that the students had almost no concept of the problems involved in stating and developing an idea, the central process in writing exposition.

Subordinately, the unease in putting words together may be noted as typical. The first confusion of *thats*, the repeti-

¹ University of California, Berkeley.

tion of "home town," the difficulties in the "I was to develop" sentence and the "surroundings and events" sentence, the misused *as*, show that the lack of organization in thought makes for a difficulty in phrasing as well. The student was probably trying to write as simply as possible, yet the chaos of his thought made even simplicity of sentence structure impossible.

The next paper, on Boulder, is typical of a smaller group.

II

Boulder Colorado is a city of fifteen thousand people. The University of Colorado is located there and most of the city's activities and functions are closely related to the college. The college is actually the main industry of Boulder, and without the school the town would have little life.

During the summer months many tourists stop or pass through Boulder. It is one of the gateways to the Rocky Mountains which are a great tourist attraction. The town is built on the edge of the great plains with its back to the rising range of the Rockies. Within a few minutes of Boulder you can be high in the mountains or far out in the flat plains.

In winter months skiing and ice skating are the main attractions. Hundreds of students and local citizens flock to the frozen lakes or to one of the many ski runs.

As in any small town you soon know practically everyone you meet. It is hard to realize the value of many friends and the feeling of being known which is hard to obtain in a larger city.

* * *

This is a little more smoothly written. It has, moreover, a good useful central idea in its first paragraph, the second sentence; and such a helpful beginning is relatively rare. Yet the development of this idea again shows no responsibility of point of view or plan. The second paragraph tends to undermine the first by its emphasis on the importance of tourists. Perhaps a contrast between winter and summer characteristics is intended, but the point of contrast is never stated or made clear in

relation to first or last paragraphs. The concluding idea of friendliness is again a new and unassociated one. In phrasing, the difficulties though present are milder; the whole essay, like a half-dozen others, sounds fairly easy and pleasant: yet it is merely a series of scraps of thought.

Fifteen thousand people . . . importance of the University . . . location and tourist attraction . . . winter sports . . . friendliness, these are all bits from a commercial folder. They do not represent a habit of thought. They do not represent a sense of composition. They indicate neither the awareness of community which Social Studies aim for, nor the awareness of technical skills which the study of English as a tool would make plain; they show indeed by their very confusion the need for greater integration of methods.

The reader may wonder whether there was no adequate paper among the thirty, no essay which did simply develop an idea about the character of a town. This one on Oakland comes closest to adequacy, I think, though it makes troubling omissions. At least it takes an attitude, a negative one about size and interrelation, and develops the idea of dependence through three clear paragraphs to a fairly summary conclusion.

III

Oakland is my home town although it is more a fairly large city than a town. Its chief characteristic seems to be that it covers a large area and thus makes transportation very difficult.

The city is apt to depend upon San Francisco, its neighbors, rather than to have a more or less independent existence as do other similar cities. Many Oakland residents work across the bay, and Oakland is known as San Francisco's bedroom.

Just as occupational activities are concentrated in the other city, so are cultural matters considered almost second class in Oakland. The Oakland Symphony orchestra is not the equal of the San Francisco Symphony orchestra; the

museums and art galleries and the theatre are lighted in Oakland. Thus, what goes on in Oakland must be considered in the light of its proximity to a larger and more important city.

Industry in my home town is growing, in fact, growth is everywhere, and the city holds more promise at the moment than it does actual accomplishment. The port promises to become very important in the future. Army and navy installations should play an important part in this development. Oakland is the western terminus of the railroads, and will not be bypassed by expanding industry for this reason.

My home town then is this. It is a large city, but it is not like similar cities because of its relation to other cities of the bay area. It is one of a network of towns and cities which have grown up around San Francisco bay.

* * *

This was the only paper which seemed conscious of the problem of exposition: the need to make a statement, to develop and substantiate it through the selection and arrangement of pertinent detail, and to reconsider it finally in the summary of detail. The fact that the author of this paper is the one who in six weeks of practice has managed to progress to C and B grades would indicate that the first-day exercise had some representative merit. The fact that he is the only one is not, I hope, representative of freshman classes as a whole. My 1A section may be this time an especially unfortunate one. Even so, its members come from all parts of the country, from all sorts of teaching systems, from Berkeley, Oakland, Piedmont, San Francisco, Los Angeles, as well as Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and it is the more surprising that all the difficulties center at the same focus; at the making and developing of statement.

I have an idea about the reasons for this difficulty, and I am not sure of its truth, but I shall propose it tentatively. It is that a sort of inert materialism, a sort of trust in data as data, uninterpreted, and a counter mistrust of human thought, has led Americans to

teach facts rather than ideas and accumulation rather than composition. When I ask students what sort of practice in writing they have had in high school, they say they have written "descriptions" or "reports," and when I ask by what principles these were organized, they look blank. When they bring me high school exercises at which they felt themselves successful, I find that they are indeed well organized, and always chronologically, as in the description of a trip, or a brief biography in the style of the encyclopedia; yet the students have copied, and have not consciously been aware of this chronological order or what use it was or to what purpose they were putting it. And of other logical orders, like implication, alternation, exemplification, they seem unaware.

It may be that we are so unaware ourselves of how to choose, how to coordinate and subordinate, how to generalize and exemplify, above all how to compose, that we cannot teach a younger generation. We may be, as the scientists have suggested to us, the victims of sheer uninterpreted data, as meaningless as can be. If so, if we have no attitudes for our facts, we shall have no predicates for our subjects, no themes for our essays, no points for our remarks, no responsibilities for our actions.

But I think the teachers of composition are the very ones who need not be so lost. They know that the subject is what the predicate makes it, and that the theme is what its development makes it. They know that the human mind can take a consistent responsibility for what it has to say. They know that the selection and arrangement of materials to a purpose, a purpose weighed and evaluated, is as serious a task as can be conceived of.

Darkness is King: A Reply to Professor Knickerbocker

DONALD J. LLOYD¹

The little *jeu d'esprit*, "The Freshman is King; or, Who Teaches Who?" by Kenneth L. Knickerbocker, is an expression at the very least of a frivolous obscurantism, or at the most of a vigorously cultivated ignorance, whose appearance in the bulletin of the CCCC is a little shocking.² It is the kind of thing we ought not to feel obliged to criticize any lay member of the educated public for writing; but as the production of a professor of English, we cannot let it go unchallenged. I therefore challenge it; and I hope that by doing so I will be understood to challenge all essays, light or serious, and all handbooks, "grammars" and workbooks which rest on the assumptions of the author of this little paper.

Let me begin by making several assertions which will leave no doubt about where I stand, or about the grounds of my criticism.

1) The Lewis survey³ is of no particular importance to teachers of English, and gives us no information about usage.

¹ Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan.

² *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. I, No. 4 (December, 1950), 11-15. Mr. Knickerbocker offers this comment on Mr. Lloyd's article: "This is a highly literate reply to my 'frivolous obscurantism.' It indicates that somewhere along the line Mr. Lloyd has been concerned with correctness. (I should like to teach my students to write as well as he does.) It may be that my little paper did not deserve to reap such a fine whirlwind, but since it did, let it blow!"

³ Norman Lewis, "How Correct Must Correct English Be?" *Harpers Magazine*, Vol. 198, (March, 1949), 68-74.

2) The nineteen "disputed expressions" have all been carefully studied and found to be in good use in this country.

3) The language of a person who uses none of these expressions is not superior to the language of one who uses some of them, or, indeed, to that of one who uses all of them.

4) The assertion or implication that the language of a person who uses none of these expressions is superior on that account is a professional error which no English teacher should commit in print, and no editor should permit him to make.

I shall develop these points one by one.

The Lewis survey is of no particular importance to teachers of English, and gives us no information about usage. It has a passing interest as a reflection of opinion, but it tells us nothing about usage. About twenty years ago, when Sterling A. Leonard undertook his study for the NCTE, a careful student of language could assume that in gathering the opinions of "qualified" observers he was conducting a genuine survey of usage, but within six years, Albert H. Marckwardt and Fred G. Walcott, in their study of the Leonard survey, pointed out explicitly that a survey of opinion is a collection of opinion and nothing more. Gathering the facts about the actual occurrence of Leonard's items, they demonstrated that the only valid evidence in the matter is that obtained by a record of the actual practices of the users of English. They refuted

many of Leonard's conclusions; and nothing has happened since their book to raise any doubt about the fallacies in his method or the validity of the method of observation. Opinion is opinion; a survey of opinion is not a survey of usage.

If Professor Knickerbocker's own "survey" has any value, it lies in his demonstration of a commonplace of anthropology and linguistics, that members of one linguistic community share the same language habits. Even this demonstration is questionable, however, because the results are based, not on any actual record of what the students say "in everyday speech" but on what they think they say; and what they think they say is opinion again. Thus it is of doubtful validity. Lewis did not ask his distinguished electors to report on their own usage, but to comment on "acceptability in educated speech" of the expressions in question. That is a different matter.

The nineteen "disputed expressions" have all been carefully studied and found to be in good use in this country. Most of them may be found treated on pages 27 to 47 of Marckwardt and Walcott's *Facts About Current English Usage*; and a seeker after information may turn up other discussions in Hall's *English Usage* (Scott, Foresman, 1917) and Pooley's *Teaching English Usage*. Or he can rout out the facts for himself in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which cites author and date of occurrence for each of its illustrative quotations. There is simply no question about them any more.

The language of a person who uses none of these expressions is not superior to the language of one who uses some of them, or, indeed, to that of one who uses all of them. I know that the reverse of this is commonly believed by educated people, but the belief is a popular

error which should not be entertained or encouraged by a teacher of English. Yet it is an obvious assumption of Professor Knickerbocker; it seems to be the assumption which led him to write his paper. It is not borne out by the record, as I have indicated above. It is merely a late reflection of the doctrine of correctness, which was evolved by amateurs in the eighteenth century, and had some plausibility while there was a small, mutually-acquainted literate class using its own dialect to distinguish itself from a large illiterate "vulgar mob." Sterling A. Leonard has traced the rise of this doctrine in a paper which should be familiar to professors of English, and has demonstrated the quicksands it rests on. Never a doctrine in any way linguistically valid, it is the sum of a set of notions peculiar to a specific social situation now long vanished. Its persistence among the literate is evidence of the long life of erroneous beliefs widely held; its persistence among English teachers is evidence of their ignorance of a body of literature important in their field.

Furthermore, to put the nineteen expressions—and some others—into the mouths of the professors is to go beyond Mr. Lewis, and to go beyond the intent of the persons who responded to his questionnaire. Clearly Professor Knickerbocker expects his readers to be shocked by his little dialog, but if I may venture an opinion clearly labelled opinion, it is not much different from what he will hear living members of our profession saying in the faculty rooms, let alone the bars. He will not hear all of them using all the expressions all the time, but he will hear many of them using all the expressions much of the time, in alternation with others he would consider correct. His dialog is like H. L. Mencken's famous rewriting of the Declaration of Independence—

it errs in frequency and proportion; and frequency and proportion are often the essence of the difference between common and standard English, as the factual study of American English grammar by C. C. Fries has clearly shown.

Finally, the assertion or implication that the language of a person who uses none of these expressions is superior on that account is a professional error which no English teacher should commit in print, and no editor should permit him to make. It ranks with the assertion in a professional journal of astronomy or geology that the world is flat.

The part which linguistics plays in the teaching of English is not large, compared with the parts played by rhetoric and stylistic. Yet it is important, and in our day its teachings are not something the English teacher can take or leave alone as he chooses. Admittedly the factual studies of the language are incomplete. They will always be incomplete. Failure to know what they are and what they mean is an error in itself and it leads to error compounded. It is responsible for the fact that the educational heart of darkness in our times is the English course as now generally taught. Emphasis on "correctness"—at the expense of information about language, at the expense of practice in reading and writing, at the expense of a fluid, knowledgeable command of our mother tongue—is responsible for the incompetence of our students in handling their language, for

their embarrassment about their own rich native regional dialects, for their anxiety when they are called upon to speak or write, for their distaste for 'English,' and for their feeling that the study of English is the study of trivialities which have no importance or meaning outside the English class.

The doctrine of correctness has been so thoroughly refuted by modern students of language that its expression is a mark of ignorance of linguistics. In our day, to make statements about English and about language which do not square with linguistics is professionally reprehensible. Yet it is an indulgence arrogantly and wilfully permitted themselves by many English teachers, not decently hidden in class, but in open publication in the journals of our field and in the concoction of the dreariest collection of ignorantly dogmatic textbooks that dominates any discipline in the schools. Certainly no man can know everything; and we can accept in good spirit an honest confession of ignorance from teachers preoccupied with other aspects of the study of English; but to write ignorantly on the very subject-matter of linguistics is inexcusable. It has been let slip by in amused silence by those who are aware of the findings of language study; but the damage caused by this sort of showing off in articles, "grammars," workbooks, and essays such as "The Freshman is King; or Who Teaches Who?" is extensive enough to demand a blunt call for a stop to it.

Secretary's Report

GEORGE S. WYKOFF¹

REPORT NO. 3:

Annual business meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

Pere Marquette Room, Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Friday, November 24, 1950.

Attendance 116.

Presiding, John C. Gerber, State University of Iowa.

1. Authorized: a letter of thanks and appreciation to Miss Anne B. Brunhumer, of the Marquette University Department of English, for her excellent services in arranging all details of the luncheon.

2. Secretary's report on membership: 466 members, as of November 24, based on figures from Mr. Hatfield's office and from reports by the officers and directors.

3. Treasurer's report: January 1, 1950 to November 20, 1950—Income from memberships and sale of bulletins and conference reports, \$1450.84. Expenditures (27 items), \$1260.70. Balance in account, November 20, 1950: \$190.14. Bills still to be paid for fall promotion and October bulletin. (Detailed report supplied for the Secretary's records.)

4. Editor's report: the first three issues of *College Composition and Communication* have been published. Suggestions, comments, and contributions welcomed.

5. Increase-of-membership discussion: moved, seconded, and passed that

(a) graduate students in English who pay a special membership fee to the NCTE be invited to become members of CCCC, and

(b) institutional-sustaining memberships be established, annual dues of \$10.00 being paid by the institution in the name of some department member such as the chairman or director of composition or communication (it being understood that such a person is a member of the NCTE); in return, three copies of each issue of *College Composition and Communication* to be sent to the named individual or to the institution's library. Income from such dues to be used primarily for the maintenance of the official bulletin.

6. Cooperation with the National Society for the Study of Communication discussion: Professor Paul Bagwell of Michigan State, president of NSSC, was represented by Professor Frederic Reeve, who suggested that the executive officers of both organizations meet to explore three possibilities: (a) a merger of NSSC and CCCC, (b) a clarification of the areas or aims in common, or (c) no cooperation. If the second, then there were suggested: a joint conference with both common and separate meetings; a joint publication; joint studies of various projects such as aims, teaching loads, etc.; and further clarification of the relationship of both groups to the parent organizations. The following resolution was moved, seconded, and passed:

That it be the sense of this meeting that cooperative effort with the National Society for the Study of Communication is highly desirable; that the officers of the CCCC be authorized to explore further the possibilities for joint and cooperative effort with the NSSC; that they be further authorized to promote such joint activities during the coming year as they and the CCCC Executive Committee agree upon.

¹ Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

7. 1951 spring conference discussion: moved, seconded, and passed that a national conference be held next spring in Chicago (the proposal for regional conferences in alternate years was held in abeyance). Approved concurrent workshops and group meetings as opposed in general meetings only or workshops only. The conference to begin Friday morning, with workshops Friday morning and afternoon and Saturday morning (none Friday night); a general meeting Friday evening; and a luncheon Saturday noon.

8. The business meeting in November 1951: preference indicated for a luncheon business meeting, followed by a discussion meeting for the first half of the afternoon.

9. Projects to be undertaken by the CCCC, through committee study, discussion sessions at conference meetings, or reports in the CCCC bulletin: moved, seconded, and passed that the following topics be recommended to the officers and executive committee for exploration:

- (a) the professional status of the composition or communication teacher
- (b) the teaching load of the composition or communication teacher
- (c) the problem of diagnostic and achievement tests (objective and essay types, etc.)
- (d) teacher training for composition or communication (graduate seminars, on-the-job training, etc.)
- (e) articulation with high schools

10. Recommendations of the nominating committee: presented by Professor Lennox Grey; accepted as presented upon motion made, seconded, and passed. The recommendations follow.

I. Recommendations for terms of

office and rotation: to provide continuity, we recommend

- (1) that the Chairman serve for one year, normally following service for one year as Associate Chairman,
- (2) that the Secretary serve for two years,
- (3) that new members of the Executive Committee (approximating one-third of the total committee) serve for three years,
- (4) that as a matter of regular procedure the retiring Chairman serve as ex-officio member of the Executive Committee,
- (5) that to establish this continuity we strongly urge that George Wykoff accept the Chairmanship despite the suggestion of the present Chairman and Secretary that they go out of office at this time.

II. Recommendations for officers:

For Chairman: George Wykoff, Purdue (one year)

For Associate Chairman: Harold Allen, Minnesota (one year)

For Secretary: Glenn Christensen, Lehigh (two years)

For Editor: Charles W. Roberts, Illinois (two years of three-year term)

For Treasurer: W. Wilbur Hatfield

III. Recommendations for members of the Executive Committee:

To continue one year:

Clyde Dow, Michigan State (University)

Kenneth Knickerbocker, Tennessee (University)

Newman B. Kirk, Tufts (Liberal Arts)

Max Fuller, Grinnell (Liberal Arts)

Sister Miriam Joseph, St. Mary's

(Liberal Arts)

Freida Johnson, Peabody (Teachers College)

Beverly Fisher, Santa Monica (Junior College)

Ralph Leyden, Stephens (Junior College)

Harvey Eagleson, Cal. Tech. (Professional)

To serve two years:

Harold Briggs, Southern California (University)

C. Rexford Davis, Rutgers (University)

Wayne Britton, San Francisco State (Liberal Arts)

Karl Dykema, Youngstown (Liberal Arts)

T. A. Barnhart, St. Cloud (Teachers College)

Jane Dale, Oregon College (Teachers College)

Shannon Morton, Wilmington (Junior College)

Mentor Williams, Illinois Tech. (Professional)

New nominees to serve for three years:

Glenn Leggett, Ohio State (University)

Henry Sams, Chicago (University)

Waters Turpin, Morgan State (Liberal Arts)

James Mason, Arkansas State (Liberal Arts)

William T. Beauchamp, Geneseo (Teachers College)

J. L. Geist, Wright (Junior College)

H. R. Bartlett, Mass. Inst. Tech. (Professional)

Paul W. Barrus, East Texas State (Professional)

Representation totals on Executive Committee: Universities 6; Liberal Arts 7; Teachers Colleges 4; Junior Colleges 4; Professional Schools 4.

The Nominating Committee:

Darrel Abel, Franklin and Marshall College

T. A. Barnhart, St. Cloud State Teachers College

Beverly Fisher, Santa Monica City College

Lennox Grey, Columbia Teachers College

Kenneth Knickerbocker, University of Tennessee

Glenn Leggett, Ohio State University

COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

Back Issues Available

Vol. I, No. 1, COLLEGE PUBLICATIONS OF FRESHMAN WRITING—*Wells* 50c

Vol. I, No. 2, WORKSHOP REPORTS OF THE 1950 CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION 75c

Vol. I, No. 3, THE ONE-LEGGED, WINGLESS BIRD OF FRESHMAN ENGLISH—*Oliver*; AFTER COMMUNICATIONS, YOU CAN'T GO HOME AGAIN—*Stabley*; THE NEED FOR THE "PERMISSIVE" IN BASIC COMMUNICATIONS—*Needham* 75c

Vol. I, No. 4, DEVELOPMENTAL WRITING—*Drake*; A PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING THE WRITING SKILL OF TECHNICAL STUDENTS—*Bowman*; THE FRESHMAN IS KING; OR, WHO TEACHES WHO?—*Knickerbocker* 75c

Address orders to W. Wilbur Hatfield, Treasurer CCCC, 211 West 68th Street,
Chicago 21, Illinois.

Editorial Comment

Unaccustomed as we English teachers are to dealing with figures, your editor would, nevertheless, like to have you join him in a little mathematical game. First, add up the number of pages in the first four issues of *College Composition and Communication*: 16 plus 44 plus 24 plus 16 equals 100. Then add to this the facts revealed by the Treasurer's report (see Section 3 of the Secretary's report printed elsewhere in this issue), and you have a remainder of unpaid bills for publication of the October and December issues of the bulletin. A glance back at your first set of figures will show that the minus sign on our present financial standing is the result of our publication of the 44-page workshop-report issue and the 24-page third issue. The long and the short division of it is that our budget is out of balance.

There are only two ways in which we can bring our budget into better balance: (1) by reducing expense by limiting each issue of CCC to 16 pages; and (2) by increasing income by (a) building up individual membership rolls, (b) securing a substantial number of institutional-sustaining memberships, (c) selling surplus copies of back issues, and (d) soliciting of paid advertise-

ments from book publishers. We have taken the first step to reduce expenses. The Treasurer will advise us when our funds warrant the publication of an issue of more than 16 pages.

You can help us increase our income if you do the following things: (1) renew your own membership for 1951, (2) persuade at least one colleague to take out an individual membership, (3) persuade the powers that be to take out an institutional-sustaining membership and thus contribute to the support and promotion of an organization devoted to the improvement of Freshman English, (4) buy copies of back issues of CCC and see that they get to the right people, and (5) plan now to attend our spring meeting and bring along interested colleagues.

We trust that the economies and the promotion indicated above will so replenish our treasury that we can occasionally break out of the 16-page strait jacket we now don, or will, at least, be spared the necessity of cramming advertising into it. Meanwhile we beg patience of our contributors who say, of their papers, "Long time no see!"

C. W. R.

Make Your Hotel Reservations Now to Attend

THE 1951 CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

MORRISON HOTEL, CHICAGO

MARCH 30-31

Prominent speakers

General meetings

Workshop sessions